

In re Appln. of Jang et al.  
Application No. 10/665,178  
Response to Office Action of March 5, 2007

**Remarks**

At the time of the Office Action claims 1-24 were pending. Claims 6 and 8-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0201739 A1 to Kuwayama (hereinafter Kuwayama). Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(e) as being obvious over Kuwayama. Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Furthermore, claim 1 is objected to due to lack of proper antecedent basis. Moreover, the abstract of the disclosure is objected to.

In the instant amendment the as-filed abstract is deleted and replaced with a new abstract, a copy of which is submitted herewith on a separate sheet in accordance with 37 CFR 1.72. Furthermore, claims 1 and 3 are amended, claims 2 and 6-24 are canceled and new claims 25-41 are introduced. The amendments and newly-submitted claims are fully supported by the as-filed specification (see, for example FIGS. 1 and 2) and introduce no new matter. Accordingly, examination of claims 1, 3-5 and 25-41 is respectfully requested.

To obviate the objection to the abstract, the as-filed abstract been replaced with a new abstract. The Applicants appreciate the Office Action's suggestions and submit that the new abstract complies with MPEP 608.01(b). To this end, the Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the abstract be withdrawn.

Claim 1 has been amended in a manner consistent with the Office Action's suggestions to obviate the objection related to lack of antecedent basis. To this end, the Applicants request that the objection to claim 1 be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as "being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01." Although the Applicants disagree with this

In re Appln. of Jang et al.  
Application No. 10/665,178  
Response to Office Action of March 5, 2007

rejection and traverse the same, in order to advance prosecution of the application, claim 1 has been amended in a manner consistent with the Office Action's suggestion (i.e., "the omitted step(s) pertain to enumerated step (d) ...") to include the limitations of as-filed claim 2, which is now canceled. The Applicants submit that claim 1 as amended overcomes the § 112, second paragraph rejection. To this end, the Applicants respectfully request an action on the merits in connection with claims 1 and 3-5.

Newly-submitted independent claims 28 and 34 are introduced to more distinctly claim the Applicants' method. Entry and examination of the same are respectfully requested. Since the English-language translation of Step (d) of claim 1 of the priority application corresponding to Step (d) of as-filed claim 1 was somewhat unclear, the Applicants have replaced "moving an image storing location to an existing folder used by the identified user" (as-filed claim 1) with "designating a user-specific folder as a location for storing and retrieving image files resulting from the user performing work with the camera" (claim 28) and "directing image files, which result from the user performing work with the camera, to be stored to and retrieved from a user-specific folder" (claim 34).

Claims 6-24 were rejected in view of Kuwayama. Although claims 6-24 are canceled in this amendment, the Applicants submit that the presently pending claims (nos. 1, 3-5 and 25-41) distinguish over Kuwayama taken alone or in combination with the other art references of record. Kuwayama discloses a digital camera with a fingerprint sensor. As shown in FIG. 4A of Kuwayama, the camera is turned on (step 200) and then waits for instruction from the user (step 202). After an instruction is received, the camera then identifies the user by fingerprint capture (steps 204, 206 and 222-230) and password input (steps 208-218). In view of FIG. 4A of Kuwayama, one can appreciate that user information is not input to the camera immediately after the camera is powered on as is now claimed in amended claim 1 and newly-submitted claims 28 and 34. The Applicants submit that Kuwayama does not disclose, teach, suggest or contemplate prompting a user for user information immediately after the camera is turned on. Even if, for argument's sake, the user information inputting (i.e., fingerprint capturing) of Kuwayama occurred immediately

In re Appln. of Jang et al.  
Application No. 10/665,178  
Response to Office Action of March 5, 2007

after illustrated step 200, the user information being input to the camera is fingerprint information, not an alphanumeric password as is recited in claims 26-28, 40 and 41. In view of the foregoing, the Applicants submit that the pending claims distinguish over Kuwayama and are allowable.

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian C. Rupp, Reg. No. 35,665  
David R. Morris, Reg. No. 53,348  
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP  
191 North Wacker Drive, Suite 3700  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1698  
(312) 569-1000 (telephone)  
(312) 569-3000 (facsimile)

Date: June 1, 2007



In re Appln. of Jang et al.  
Application No. 10/665,178  
Response to Office Action of March 5, 2007

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION OF MARCH 5, 2007 (along with any documents referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.

Date: June 1, 2007

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Irina L. Mikitiouk

CH02/ 22483669.1